STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES
PO Box 45811, Olympia WA 98504-5811

DATE: May 17, 2016

TO: RFQQ # 1623-594 Bidders

FROM: Sarah Pendleton, Solicitation Coordinator
DSHS Central Contracts and Legal Services

SUBJECT: **Amendment No. 2– Bidder's Q & A and Schedule Change**

DSHS amends the RFQQ # 1623-594 solicitation document to:

1. Respond to the Bidder Questions below; and

2. Amend the solicitation schedule as in Section C (1) of the RFQQ document as follows:

Solicitation Schedule

Item	Action	Date
1.	DSHS Issues RFQQ	April 29, 2016
2.	Bidder may submit written questions and comments until 3 p.m. PST	May 13, 2016
3.	DSHS will Issue responses.	May 18, 2016
4.	Bidders may submit written Complaints by 3 p.m. PST	May 25, 2016
5.	Bidder must submit Response by 3pm p.m. PST	June 1, 2016
6.	DSHS evaluation of Written Responses	June 7 – 13, 2016
7.	Reference Checks	June 14-July 12, 2016
8.	(Optional) DSHS invites top scoring Bidders to provide a demonstration of their solution	June 14, 2016
9.	(Optional) Bidder Demonstrations, if determined to be necessary by DSHS	July 7-8, 2016
10.	DSHS notifies Apparent Successful and Non-Successful Bidders and begins contract negotiations	July 13, 2016
11.	Bidders may request Debriefing until 3 p.m. PST	July 18, 2016
12.	DSHS holds Debriefing conferences, if requested	July 21-22, 2016
13.	Unsuccessful Bidders may submit Protest(s) until 3 p.m. PST	July 29, 2016
14.	DSHS considers and responds to any Protests	August 5, 2016
15.	Contract Execution	August 8, 2016
16.	Desired “Go-Live” Date	September 30, 2016

Question #1: We believe that our firm can develop the hosted platform for prevention services data entry, analysis, and reporting, including the improved flexibility and efficiencies that DSHS desires. However, a planned contract execution date of August 8, 2016 coupled with a go live date of September 30 (data entry by October 15), in reality, allows only existing one-size-fits-all solutions to compete. Is there any flexibility in the go-live date that would allow DSHS to consider solutions that benefit from a deeper understanding of DSHS's administrative and user needs, but would require more time to develop?

With a potential 9-year time frame (5-year initial contract plus up to four 1-year renewals), the decision on vendor and platform now will have long-term impact. We believe that DSHS may get more long-term bang for the buck by considering a Prevention MIS developed specifically to your needs and your unique partners.

Answer:
The timeline outlined in the RFQQ takes into consideration the system transitions that will need to be developed and executed. Vendors are asked to demonstrate their ability to meet the proposed timeline in Attachment D, Bidder Response Form, and will be scored accordingly.

DSHS has been able to secure a contract extension with its current MIS vendor for six (6) months from July 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016 to allow for this solicitation process to be completed. Even with this contract extension, there is very little timeline flexibility, as DSHS considers the current system to be sun-setting June 30, 2016. The (6)-month contract extension with the current vendor is the time period that DSHS has to acquire a new solution, ensure all data is entered into the current system, and work with providers to transition data entry into a new system based on an established timeline.

All Vendors who believe they can meet the requirements as provided in the Solicitation Document and its Attachments may submit a Response to this RFQQ.

Question #2: Is evaluation capacity building and technical assistance expected as part of the scope of work? Does Washington State work with state-level intermediaries that provide support and feedback?

Answer:
Not directly, Washington's State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup (SEOW) works within DSHS to provide evaluation support documents to be used by contractors. Prevention System Managers (DBHR contract managers) provide technical assistance to the DSHS prevention contractors in identifying the targeted problems for each community based on the report from the SEOW. It is

not a requirement of the new solution to interact with the report generated by the SEOW.

Question #3: 59 funded sites are mentioned, but hundreds of contractors are also mention. What is the probable number of points of contact?

Answer:
Direct Point Of Contact for state control of the system is approximately ten (10). We estimate that indirect Points of Contact (prevention contractor accounts) who could submit helpdesk tickets could reach approximately four hundred (400).

Question #4: Is this a replacement for http://www.theathenaforum.org/?

Answer:
No, this is a replacement for the Performance Based Prevention System (PBPS).

Question #5: What are the ways the state managers interact with the contractors in the prevention system?

Answer:
The Prevention System Managers (PSMs) provide technical assistance and monitoring for assigned prevention contracts. This includes guidance through the Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) process in building a strategic plan, action plan, logic model, and budget to be approved by DBHR. Once a plan is approved, PSMs work to monitor and provide technical assistance to ensure the approved plan is implemented in the fiscal year for which it is approved.

Anticipated PSM interaction with a new solution:
1. Approve budget to funding source per contract allocation.
2. Approve risk/protective factors.
3. Approve objectives.
4. Approve programs (survey instruments to measure objectives, funding source, dosing frequency/duration, number to be served, and a program implementation plan).
5. Monthly monitoring/report query of service delivery to approve contractor invoices.
6. Monthly monitoring of planned service delivery compared to reported service delivery to provide technical assistance and training.
7. Approve changes in implementation plan.
8. If needed, approve performance improvement proposals.

Question #6: In what ways do you expect the COTS MIS to differ from DFCme?

Answer:
DSHS/DBHR does not receive funding to report into this platform. Therefore, we cannot compare/contrast the expectations of the Washington solution to DFCme.

Question #7: See items 51-52 of Table 1, Competitive Solicitation #1623-594. Can the budgeting and fund tracking be the same system? Do you see them serving different functionality?

Answer:
We do see budgeting and fund tracking serving different functions and require them in the new system. We do not require these qualifications remain separate in the new systems. For clarification, we provide the function of each here:

Budget: a desired solution would allow each account to set an annual budget per DBHR funding source.

Fund tracking: as contractors enter service data, a desired solution would allow each account to show how the budgeted amounts are deducting from the original allocation per DBHR fund source to ensure fiscal compliance.

Question #8: Is invoice generation part of the specifications at this point? It was mentioned earlier.

Answer:
DSHS currently has a method for receiving invoices that is outside of the MIS. If a proposed solution offers this feature, the Bidder is free to include it in the proposal for consideration indicating whether it is included in the quoted system or may be separately purchased and at what price.

Question #9: Does the finalist have to meet all the required qualifications, or will you be going with a contractor that meets more than other potential contractors?

Answer:
We will base our decisions on scores from the RFQQ. Bidder is asked to indicate if they are able to meet the qualifications in the RFQQ and will be scored accordingly. Please note that there are some mandatory requirements that must be met by the Bidder, and some that are desired. We do require that Bidders respond to all the qualifications.

Question #10: Does the Washington State Department of Social & Health Services have a specific indirect costs (AKA Facilities and Administrative Costs, Overhead) rate percentage restriction? For instance, some state agencies have a specific restriction based on either legislative mandate, their own negotiated agreement, or based on the source of funds.

Answer:
Yes, eight-percent (8%)

Question #11: What is the source of funds for this program? Specifically, are they federal flow-through, state revenue, or a combination?

Answer:
Funding may come from any of the following sources:
Federal Substance Abuse Prevention Block Grant (SABG), Federal Discretionary Funds, State Revenue.

The funds allocated for the development and build-out portion of a new Prevention Management Information System are approximately $140,000.

Question #12: Attachment D, specifically Section D-5 Quotation/Price Proposal, mentions that "Bidders are required to collect and pay Washington State sales tax, if applicable, but should not include it in your price proposal." It is our understanding through this project that the selected Bidder will not be collecting accounts receivables. Is there any situation in which the bidder would have to collect and/or pay Washington State sales tax?

Answer:
The referenced phrase is meant to inform Bidders that they should <u>not</u> include sales or use taxes in their proposed pricing to DSHS. The winning Bidder (contractor) will be responsible for determining whether taxes must be collected under Washington Law for any of the services it is quoting and add it to applicable invoices – which DSHS will pay. (Washington state Department of Revenue http://dor.wa.gov/Content/Home/Default.aspx or 1-800-647-7706.)

Question #13: Would the State consider a solution that needs minor adjustments and configurations in both code and data structure to support WA needs or does it need to be fully configurable without any code changes?

Answer:
Yes, we will consider solutions requiring a range of configurations and appreciate Bidders providing details of the configuration in the comments column so we can know if the solution requires new code and data structure. Please ensure that the proper "Self-Certify" descriptor is selected for each answer, which assists in evaluating Bidders' responses.

Question #14: Is the data-driven needs assessment an automated process or is there any manual intervention involved?

Answer:
A manual intervention is involved. Prevention contractors work in their respective communities to use local data books provided from the State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup (SEOW) to assess local needs for strategic planning. The outcomes of the needs assessment process are then used to build a strategic plan to identify programs and strategies for implementation. The strategies identified in the plan are then managed in the MIS.

Question #15: In addition to attendance mentoring outcomes, is the state interested in scheduling sessions within the system?

Answer:
Yes, however it not a requirement and DSHS would need to know if this would increase the cost of the solution. The priority is that a solution would track mentor/mentee matches and the subsequent meetings/activity of each match, and measure the outcomes of the program. Please state whether any additional scheduling functionality is included in the Bidder's Price proposal, whether it is included in the quoted system or if it may be purchased separately, and at what price.

Question #16: Does the state expect use of Adobe PDF forms for the purpose of uploading form templates or another means of accomplishing this function?

Answer:
Adobe PDF forms are an option, but we prefer use of web-based forms that users can submit and from which data analysis can be performed.

Question #17: These items and Page 10 Item 41 seem to both indicate a 100% amorphous data model and UI that can change on the fly. Is this the expectation from the State?

Answer:
For the most part we need it to be configured into the structure provided by WA Prevention Framework, but needs to be able to accept changes in the structure of the prevention framework if it changes in the coming years.

Question #18: Building Queries #32, Is the state expecting a UI function available in the system that will allow users to create SQL from on-screen elements, or will users be entering SQL statements directly into the system via an interface to be provided by the vendor?

Answer:
We need a function for non-developers to create/modify fields/selections in forms. Subcontractors will provide data as lists or as completed forms. Therefore,

we need a system that allows specific users to create SQL form on-screen elements.

Question #19: Workflow #40, This item seems to imply a workflow design module within the system. Is it the expectation from the State?

Answer:
A workflow design would be required if the inherent layout of the solution does not convey WA's Prevention Framework. A functional workflow design is an acceptable solution for synchronizing communities understanding of their location in the prevention framework.

Question #20: Ability of users to add/edit fields #41, Is the state's expectation that the user performing these edits will also be allowed to define data field validations without coding? If so will the need to incorporate contextual reference data be needed as well?

Answer:
Yes, we need select users to have the ability to define valid data fields without coding. In terms of contextual reference, we need the data that contractors input to fields to have reference within the prevention framework and be linked to the system user who is inputting the data.

Question #21: Desired "Go-Live" Date #16, How much customization will be allowed to the system after the go-live date? Which modules and functionalities need to be 100% operational on day one?

Answer:
DSHS desires that all requirements are met by the stated Go-Live date. Attachment D-Bidder Response Form allows for Bidders to identify the timeline that their solution would make each requirement available and provides the corresponding scoring method associated with Bidder's proposed timeline. Therefore, all qualifications listed have been determined as critical. Also, we will consider all Bidder timelines, especially if no Bidder can meet the desired Go-Live date.

Question #22: How does the state allocate federal funding to the tribes, and does the state ask for data commensurate with other prevention providers?

Answer:
Tribes are offered a set allocation based on a Consolidated Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) through the Office of Indian Policy (OIP). Tribes develop work plans that address local tribal needs and are reviewed and approved by the state prior to implementation. Data collected by Tribes varies based upon the approved plan.

Question #23: On form D-4, Form Generator, question 19, could the state please elaborate on the types of forms it wishes to generate?

Answer:
We need forms from which users can select options from dropdowns and/or can provide text with a set character limit. The type of form is not prescribed, but we need the data from the form to be available for query and analysis into reports. Web-based forms are an example, but not prescribed.

Question #24: On form D-4, Data interface, question 50, could the state please give further requirements for the types of files it would wish to batch upload (non-real time) versus web-services (real time)? What types of systems would the files be coming from or going to? We are requesting a specifications document for the data set that should be uploaded or sent.

Answer:
An example of these specifications is detailed in the Attachment A-Sample Contract, *Special Terms and Conditions, (3) Statement of Work, (a) Scheduled Deliverables, (5) Establish and document a process to receive OSPI data transfer from RMC, reformatting the data as identified, and providing a transfer to the Prevention MIS*. Following the award of a contract, the successful Bidder, DSHS, and OSPI will work to establish the process for the batch uploads to be maintained on a schedule and in a format that matches the specifications consistent with the new MIS. Test procedures will need to be considered prior to the desired Go-Live date of September 30, 2016.

Question #25: On Pg. 16 of the RFP in Section C under Item 1 "Solicitation Schedule": Please define what is meant by "Desired “Go-Live” Date".

Answer:
DSHS desires that all requirements are met by the stated Go-Live date. Attachment D-Bidder Response Form allows for Bidders to identify the timeline that their solution would make each requirement available and provides the corresponding scoring method associated with Bidder’s proposed timeline. Therefore, all qualifications listed have been determined as critical. All Bidder timelines will be considered in the scoring process.

Question #26: Is the targeted go-live date tied to a federal grant source utilizing either a FFY2015 or FFY2016 award?

Answer:
Yes both FFY2015 and FFY2016.

Question #27: On Pg. 14 of the RFP in Section D-2 Item 5 "Proposed Work / Implementation Plan – provide a detailed work breakdown structure of all deliverables (with definitions) required to achieve the scope of this request. Include estimated durations for each to support a completed solution go-live date of no later than September 30, 2016." - Does this reflect that the state desires the full system to "Go Live" no later than September 30, 2016 or that the Proposed Work/Implementation Plan be completed by September 30, 2016?

Answer:
The state desires the full system to Go-Live by September 30, 2016.

Question #28: On Pg. 3 of the RFP in Section A Item 2 the state describes the following: "When contractors submit invoices for payment to DSHS, an MIS is needed to ensure payments can be delivered based on the data entered for the month's expenditure claim. DBHR contractors enter participant data, service data, and outcome data, which includes pre- and post-tests for direct program delivery of Evidence-Based and Research-Based Prevention Programs monthly. Again, a MIS needs to generate customized outcome reports of program delivery by group for PSMs to determine positive or negative outcomes based on an established objective (i.e., reducing a risk factor, improving a protective factor) from the provider's prevention plan." - Does the state utilize a standard outcome tool across all counties/providers? If not, how many unique pre/posttest outcome tools are utilized across counties/providers that the state desires to be built into the system?

Answer:
A standard outcome tool is not used. Contractors select from a list of validated instruments that contain scales to measure the intended outcome for each selected program. Currently, there are 47 surveys assigned to programs and under use in the system. The state will need the ability to have multiple pre/post survey instruments in the system. Additionally the state will need the ability to add instruments as needed based on updated EBP, RBP, PP program lists.

Question #29: Does the state require data migration from the current system or from the interim data collection solution that will be put into place after the current system sunsets in June? If data migration is desired, will the state provide the format of data and an estimate for how much data will need to be migrated into the new system?

Answer:
The state does not expect a migration from the current system to a new solution. With a Go-Live date of September 30, 2016, and a contract extension with the

current vendor from July 1, 2016 to December 30, 2016, the state does not anticipate having an interim data collection solution.

Question #30: The Department asks for reporting capabilities to respond to legislative requests as they arise. Can you provide an example of 2-3 of those prior requests?

Answer:
1. Number of Services by legislative District?
2. Outcomes (numbers served, improvement from pre to post) achieved for programs in a particular county?
3. How much state and federal funds are supporting Rx prevention programing?
4. How are you addressing Health Disparities? (i.e.: number of services delivered compared to census data, cultural competency components of strategic plan).
5. How many coalitions are addressing the risk factor *favorable attitudes*?

Question #31: For Data Interface, is the requirement seeking information about our capabilities, or is it asking us to scope any particular integrations as a part of our response. If we are required to scope integrations, please provide more details.

Answer:
We are seeking your solution’s ability to meet the requirements listed. It is up to the Bidder’s discretion to determine their capabilities and when they may be available, which should be recorded in the answer section of Attachment D Bidder Response Form.

All other terms and conditions in this Solicitation remain the same.